

Serial No.: 09/881,133

R E M A R K S

Claims 1, 6, 8, 38, 43, 45, 53, 71, 74-76, 84, 87-89 and 95-101 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum and/or Ludwig. Claims 1, 6, 8, 38, 43, 45, 53, 71, 74-76, 95 and 97 have been amended. Claims 84, 87-89 and 96 and 98-101 have been canceled. The remaining claims stand rejected over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum.

The present application teaches techniques for connecting a geographically dispersed group to prepare a presentation such as a script for a live performance (perhaps for use in a courtroom setting). Plantz and Tanenbaum teach mutually exclusive alternate methods to have a geographically dispersed group of contributors prepare a document.

The problem shared by these approaches is to permit collaboration without creating chaos, that is, to maintain coherence in the final product. Plantz attempts to do resolve this problem using a very exclusive approach in which only one contributor can edit the document at one time. Tanenbaum attempts to resolve the same problem by using a very inclusive approach in which all edits are automatically, immediately incorporated in all copies of the documents. There is no logical combination of these approaches because they teach opposite ends of the spectrum of collaborative editing, including one edit at a time or including as edits simultaneously.

The present invention addresses additional problems inherent in the group preparation of live presentations for third parties, and/or scripts for live presentations, such as witness testimony at

Serial No.: 09/881,133

a trial. The teachings of Plantz and Tanenbaum relied upon in the current rejections seem to be related to viewing of the contributions by other members of the group. The presentation in the present application will eventually be made live to third parties, that is, to parties other than those in contributing group although contributors will also likely be present.

For example, as claimed in claim 95 as amended, the document prepared by group collaboration is a script for the presentation - not a transcript of it. This aspect of the difference between the approaches taken in Plantz and Tanenbaum may be seen in claim 97 as amended in which the document prepared by the group is a script which may include a listing of URL addresses for documentary evidence. During the presentation, such documents may be retrieved and displayed for the judge and jury. Plantz and Tanenbaum contemplate transferring edits over a network during preparation but not presentation as claimed.

In any event, the approach taken herein is neither the automatic exclusive or inclusive approaches taught by Plantz and Tanenbaum respectively nor a "middle ground" approach obvious over the combination of these references. The present invention provides a controller with the opportunity to control the quality of the final presentation by controlling by selection the edits made to the contents of the document or presentation. The contributors cannot edit the final document directly as taught by Plantz and Tanenbaum but rather the controller controls the edit of the final document by selecting some, but not necessarily all, of the contributions while rejecting others.

Serial No.: 09/881,133

Claim amendments have been made to clarify and better distinguish the present invention from the mutually exclusive automatic approaches taught by Plantz and Tanenbaum.

Applicant respectfully repeats his arguments concerning Plantz in the previous response.

Claim 1:

Independent claim 1 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum. Claim 1 has been amended.

Tanenbaum is said to teach, at col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 14, making the proposed contributions available for concurrent viewing, editing and comment by the contributors.

Applicant respectfully traverses and points out that Tanenbaum does not teach that that proposed changes are made available for viewing, editing or comment but rather teaches that each change in the document made by each contributor is immediately made in all versions of the document, see Tanenbaum col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 4.

It has also been said that Tanenbaum teaches, at col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 14, managing the preparation of the presentation by including one or more of the proposed contributions, selected by the controller in the presentation.

Applicant respectfully traverses and points out that Tanenbaum does not teach managing the preparation of the presentation by having a single controller select one or more, but not all, of the proposed contributions but rather teaches the use of a control means, such as a microprocessor, at each terminal to manage the

Serial No.: 09/881,133

transfer of data between terminals by automatically including all edits so that all copies of the document are always the same, see Tanenbaum col. 2, lines 47 -57.

Further, the control means in Tanenbaum does not render obvious managing the presentation by having a controller selectively including some but not all of the proposed contributions in the presentation because Tanenbaum teaches that a separate microprocessor control means is required at each location.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the method as claimed in claim 1 amended of connecting a contributors to a single controller, the controller managing the preparation of the presentation by selectively including one or more but not all of the proposed contributions in the presentation.

Claim 6:

Claim 6 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum and has been amended. Tanenbaum is said to teach managing the preparation of the presentation by making instructions from the contributors visible to the controller over the network, at col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 14. Applicant respectfully traverses and points out that Tanenbaum teaches that the microprocessor in each terminal reads the instructions from each other terminal for making the changes required by the other contributor to the copy of the document in that terminal, see col. 2, lines 47-59.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the method as claimed in claim 6 amended of the controller based selection process including making instructions

Serial No.: 09/881,133

from the contributors visible to the controller for use by the controller in selecting the one or more but not all of the proposed contributions to be included in the presentation.

Claim 8:

Claim 8 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum. Tanenbaum is said to teach including a path for retrieving a selected contribution through the network during a display of the presentation at col. 2, line 25 to col. 3, line 14. Applicant respectfully traverses and notes that nothing in the cited passage teaches retrieving the contributions during the presentation but rather Tanenbaum teaches retrieving the contributions from the contributors during preparation of the presentation only.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the method as claimed in claim 8 amended of displaying the prepared presentation to third parties by retrieving at least one portion of the presentation via a path through the network included with a proposed contribution.

Claim 38:

Independent claim 38 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum and has been amended. Applicant understands this rejection to say that Tanenbaum teaches a controller terminal operable to make the proposed contributions available through the network for concurrent viewing, editing and comment by contributors and to allow a controller to manage the preparation of the presentation by selecting one or more of the proposed contributions for inclusion into the presentation. Applicant respectfully traverses and points out, as noted above with regard to claim 1, that Tanenbaum teaches the use of a microprocessor controller which

Serial No.: 09/881,133

adds all contributions to all copies of the document without the use of a selection process.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the system as claimed in claim 38 amended which calls for a system for preparing a presentation including a controller terminal to allow a controller to i) manage the preparation of the presentation by selecting one or more but not all of the proposed contributions for inclusion into the presentation nor ii) to provide the controller access through the network to the storage devices to retrieve the selected contributions during display of the completed presentation to third parties.

Claims 43, 45:

Dependent claims 43 and 45 stand rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum using the same rational used for claims 6 and 8. Applicant repeats his traverse and remarks.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the systems as claimed in claims 43 and 45 amended including a controller terminal operable to i) provide instructions to the controller for use in selecting the one or more but not all of the proposed contributions for inclusion while preparing the presentation or ii) to prepare a presentation script, the script including a path for retrieving a selected contribution through the network from a storage device during display of the presentation in accordance with the script to third parties.

Claim 53:

Claim 53 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum and has been amended. Tanenbaum is said to teach a

Serial No.: 09/881,133

controller terminal operable to retrieve a selected contribution from the respective storage device during display of the prepared presentation. Applicant respectfully traverses and points out that Tanenbaum teaches group preparation of a document but not the display of a completed presentation, for example, to third parties such as in a court room nor the retrieval of a selected proposed contribution during that presentation from a storage device under the control of the contributor of that selected contribution.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious a system as claimed in claim 53 as amended including a controller terminal operable to retrieve a selected contribution from the respective storage device under the control of the respective contributor during display of the prepared presentation to third parties.

Claim 71:

Independent claim 71 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum. Applicant understands the rejection to say that the rejection is based on a similar rational to the rejection applied to claim 1. Applicant repeats his traverse and remarks.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the method claimed in claim 71 as amended including the step of displaying contributions selected by the controller as part of the display of the completed presentation to third parties.

Claims 74, 76:

Claims 74 and 76 stand rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum using the same rational as applied to claims 6 and 8. Applicant repeats his traverse and remarks.

Serial No.: 09/881,133

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the method claimed in claim 74 as amended including the step of connecting the contributors to provide instructions for use by the controller in selecting one or more but not all of the proposed contributions during the preparation of the presentation.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the method claimed in claim 76 as amended including the step of retrieving a selected contribution through the network, from a path included in the script, during the display of the presentation to third parties.

Claim 75:

Claim 75 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum. Tanenbaum is said to teach connecting the contributors to the controller to concurrently provide instructions to the controller to prepare a presentation script identifying the selected contributions to be included in the presentation. Applicant respectfully traverses and repeats his arguments.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the method claimed in claim 75 as amended including the step of the controller preparing a presentation script identifying the selected contributions to be included in the presentation.

If this rejection is maintained, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out with greater specificity teachings in Plantz or Tanenbaum, individually or combined, which render obvious steps of preparing a presentation script by



Serial No.: 09/881,133

identifying selected ones of the one or more but not all of the proposed contributions.

Claims 84, 87-89:

Independent claim 84, and dependent claims 87-89 stand rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum and have been canceled.

Claim 95:

Independent claim 95 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum and has been amended. Plantz is said to teach a method for preparing a script for a presentation. Applicant respectfully traverses that Plantz teaches or renders obvious a method or preparing a script.

Plantz teaches a group publishing method in which contributors, on a one at a time basis, may edit a document stored at a central location. A live presentation, such as witness testimony in a court room, may be reduced to a document for example by a court reporter, but a live presentation includes aspects of a live performance, presented to third parties rather than to the contributors and/or the controller. A script for a live performance may include portions of a document and may also include instructions which permit a computer to access a portion for inclusion in the live performance over the network that was proposed by a contributor.

Plantz at col. 4, line 64 to col. 5, line 4, cited in the Office Action, teaches only

"The present invention relates to a computer-based Group Publishing System (GPS) for enhancing collaboration between and among individuals who may be

Serial No.: 09/881,133

separated by distance and/or time. Principal among the goals of this invention is to facilitate, in a desktop computing environment, through the Internet or other networked computing environment, a jointly authored and edited project. Multiple users can simultaneously work on the same project."

If this rejection is maintained, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically identify which aspects of the Plantz or Tanenbaum references which are said to teach or render obvious the preparation of a script for a live performance to third parties.

Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the method, as claimed in claim 95 as amended of connecting contributors to a control operator through a network to create a virtual scripting office for the joint preparation in real time of a script for a live presentation, accepting proposed modifications as temporary script elements and incorporating one or more but not all of the proposed modifications into the script by the control operator.

Claim 97:

Claim 97 stands rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum and has been amended. Nothing in Plantz or Tanenbaum, singly or combined, teaches or renders obvious the step of retrieving one or more script elements, from URL address provided in the script, during the live presentation to third parties rather than only as part of the script preparation process.

Claims 96, 100, 101:

Serial No.: 09/881,133

Claims 96, 100 and 101 stand rejected as obvious over Plantz in view of Tanenbaum and further in view of Ludwig and have been canceled to reduce the issues in this case. Applicant reserves the right to refile these or similar claims in a continuing application.

Applicant has substantially reduced the claims at issue in a sincere attempt to move this case to issue and reserve the right to submit these and similar claims in subsequent continuation applications. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider his rejections of the pending claims in light of the amendments and remarks presented herein and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Norman E. Brunell Reg. #26533/  
Norman E. Brunell, Reg. No. 26,533

IRELL & MANELLA LLP  
Customer No. 29000  
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4276  
(310) 277-1010  
(310) 203-7199 Facsimile  
nbrunell@irell.com